



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/752,522	01/03/2001	Takeo Murase	1095.1148/JDH	9988

21171 7590 03/08/2004
STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

BLACKWELL, JAMES H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/752,522

Applicant(s)

MURASE ET AL.

Examiner

James H Blackwell

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plantz et al. (hereinafter Plantz, U.S. Patent No. 6,088,702) in view of Mizuta et al. (hereinafter Mizuta, U.S. Patent No. 5,280,574).

In regard to independent Claim 1 (and similarly to independent Claims 6 and 7), Plantz teaches a Group Publishing System (GPS) for permitting coordinated publishing, assembly and administration of texts by an unlimited number of authors or editors, each of whom may perform word processing, document assembly and editing functions on the same or different portions of a group authored project (see Abstract; compare to Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 6 and 7), ***"An electronic document processing system including a plurality of electronic document processors connected to each other by a network, wherein each of said electronic document processors comprising: reception means for receiving an electronic document transmitted from another of said electronic document processors; processing means for carrying out predetermined processing on said electronic document received by said receptions means"***). Plantz also teaches that the GPS provides a publishing/editing control form 160 for the specific document. This form preferably comprises the following

components: an indication of the current topic 161; an executable link to the current author's e-mail address 162; the name of the current or main author of the document 163; the name of the editor 164; an executable link to the assigned editor's e-mail address 165, etc. ... (Col. 9, lines 35-43; compare to Claim 1 (and similarly to Claims 6 and 7), ***"first storage means for generating a log of said predetermined processing carried out by said processing means, and storing said log in a predetermined resource"***). Plantz does not specifically teach a separate log file or storing such a separate log file. However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to assume that some means of storage exists for data contained in the publishing/editing control form providing the benefit of obtaining a section of text to author or edit. Plantz fails to teach *derivative electronic document generation means for generating a derivative electronic document which is a new electronic document derived from said electronic document, according to a result of said predetermined processing carried out by said processing means* and *"second storage means for storing information indicating a correlation between said electronic document and said derivative electronic document in a predetermined resource, when said derivative electronic document is generated by said derivative electronic document generation means*. However, Mizuta teaches a documents managing method that is suitable for permitting a user to arrange an original document into various fashions for utilization. The system automatically manages the relations between an original document and the arrangement fashions thereof and the relations of derivations between documents, whereby a user has better ease of handling documents arranged

from the original document and documents derived therefrom, with the original document as the starting point. When the updates of an original document have come to require updates in the arrangement fashions and derived documents of the original document, the required updates can be made without omission and with ease (Col. 3, lines 56-67, Col. 4, lines 1-6; compare to Claim 1 (and similarly to Claims 6 and 7),

"derivative electronic document generation means for generating a derivative electronic document which is a new electronic document derived from said electronic document, according to a result of said predetermined processing carried out by said processing means" and ***"second storage means for storing information indicating a correlation between said electronic document and said derivative electronic document in a predetermined resource, when said derivative electronic document is generated by said derivative electronic document generation means"***). Mizuta fails to teach *transmission means for transmitting said electronic document processed by said processing means and said derivative electronic document generated by said derivative electronic document generation means to a next one of said electronic document processors*. However, Plantz teaches that the GPS provides support for efficiently finding, retrieving and storing the correct revisions of documents in process, even though multiple authors or editors may jointly be contributing to the assembly of the publication project, and even though these authors and editors may be geographically remote from each other (Col. 6, lines 47-53; compare to Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 6 and 7), ***"transmission means for transmitting said electronic document processed by said processing means and***

said derivative electronic document generated by said derivative electronic document generation means to a next one of said electronic document processors”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Mizuta and Plantz because the taught GPS system would have allowed individual authors/editors to have saved revisions of their work so that others would have been able to further edit them.

In regard to dependent Claim 2, Plantz teaches a master editor for the document, permitting, for example, final administrative review of all edited aspects of the project (Col. 11, lines 1-4, Fig. 4; compare to Claim 2, ***“tracking request entry means for receiving a tracking request for tracking a predetermined electronic document”***). Plantz also teaches means for calling up a summary of the status of each available chapter within a project (Col. 11, lines 18-19; compare to Claim 2, ***“status display means for obtaining a log corresponding to said predetermined resource, and displaying information indicating a present status of said predetermined electronic document, when said tracking request for tracking said predetermined electronics document is made by said tracking request entry means”*** and ***“said status display means also displaying a status of said derivative electronic document correlated with said electronic document of which said tracking request was made, by also referring to said information indicating said correlation between said electronic document and said derivative electronic document”***).

In regard to dependent Claim 3, Plantz fails to teach that *when a plurality of derivative electronic documents to be generated contain a common content, said derivative electronic document generation means combines said plurality of derivative electronic documents into a single derivative electronic document*. However, Mizuta teaches that a new arrangement may well be registered as the composition of two or more existing arrangements as illustrated in the form of the arrangement fashion storing area 17A of the Document A in FIG. 7a (Col. 34, lines 33-36; compare to Claim 3, “... ***when a plurality of derivative electronic documents to be generated contain a common content, said derivative electronic document generation means combines said plurality of derivative electronic documents into a single derivative electronic document***”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have combined the teachings of Plantz and Mazuta providing the benefit of having generated derived documents from an original document.

In regard to dependent Claim 4, Plantz teaches that a user begins an editing session by accessing the gateway or top-level of the GPS URL, through which the user is permitted access to the document to be edited or authored. To prevent unauthorized access, the GPS requires each user to provide a username and a password to access the editing module of the system (Col. 7, lines 28-33; compare to Claim 4, “... ***said electronic document contain first access limiting information for limiting access of users to said electronic document, said each electronic document processor including access permitting means responsive to a request of access to said electronic document, for permitting only an authorized user to gain said access***”).

to said electronic document, through comparison with rights of users and said first access limiting information"). Plantz also teaches that the user next has the option of specifying whether they are an "author" 131 or an "editor" 132. Selection of the "author" option, 131, initiates a GPS subroutine calling for the authorized author to supply their username 141 and password 142 for author log-in 140, (see FIG. 6 for one embodiment of the layout for these functions). At this level, it is also possible for a new author to supply a username and password for acceptance of the new author as an expert, or by other criteria, for publishing of an unassigned topic. If a new author signs into the system, his or her name is added to a GPS database of usernames and passwords. Upon providing the required log-in data, a log-in selection 143 executes the log-in command, and if approved username and password data are supplied by the user, access to a menu of topics, subtopic, or chapters 151, 152, 153 for which the author is authorized to contribute is provided 150, along with a selection 154 to view or edit the selected document (Col. 9, lines 16-32; compare to Claim 4, ***"said log contains second access limiting information for limiting access of users to said log, said access permitting means being responsive to a request of access to said log, for permitting only an authorized user to gain said access to said log, through comparison with said rights of said users and said second access limiting information"***).

In regard to dependent Claim 5, Plantz teaches that the GPS of this invention offers support for organizing the production of documents. It assists with the layout of the document, with planning tasks and responsibilities, and with tracking the progress of

Art Unit: 2176

work. In addition, through the e-mail links embedded at appropriate locations within the GPS, it is possible for any user of the GPS to contact any other participants on a project, without having to exit the GPS to use other applications. Furthermore, administration of the project assembly process, assignment of projects to authors and editors, and overall GPS maintenance by a GPS administrator is facilitated by an administration control center (Col. 6, lines 66-67; Col. 7, lines 1-10; compare to Claim 5, ***“... said log has information indicating a status of a business process written therein, said business process being started by reception of said electronic document, said status display means also displaying information indicating said status of said business process as status information”***).


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 703-305-0940. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
02/25/04


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER